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| **Audience** | Author completely understands who his or her audience is. Author demonstrates the ability to choose appropriate language and content to argue. | Author mostly understands who his or her audience is and uses fairly appropriate language and content to argue. | Author shows some understanding of his or her audience; however, it is not always consistent, and audience occasionally has difficulties following author's arguments. | Author doesn't understand who his or her audience is; there is no consistency in argument and use of language. |  |
| **Introduction** | Title explains an overview of persuasive writing appropriately. Introduction about what author intends to achieve in writing by asking a question or presenting an issue properly is stated clearly. Introduction grabs reader’s attention and triggers interest in the topic of persuasive writing. | Title explains an overview of persuasive writing adequately. Introduction about what author intends to achieve in writing by asking a question and presenting an issue is stated fairly well. However, the introduction could be polished with more effort. It grabs reader's attention and interest in the topic of persuasive writing fairly well. | From title, content of persuasive writing is predictable but not clearly stated to audience. Introduction explains rough overview of writing and is understandable, but it should be stated more clearly. In introduction, author tries to grab reader's attention and interest in the topic of persuasive writing, but it is not necessarily successful. | Title hardly explains an overview of persuasive writing. Introduction gives few clues to predict author's intention of writing without giving specific questions and issues. Introduction doesn't spark any interest in the topic of persuasive writing. |  |
| **Supporting details** | Body includes three or more pieces of evidence to argue the question and issue that are stated in introduction. The position of author is clearly mentioned by giving examples, research results or accounts of personal experience of a topic. | Body includes three or more pieces of evidence to argue the question and issue that are stated in introduction. The position of author, mentioned by giving examples, research results, or accounts of personal experience of the topic, is fairly clear | Body includes two pieces of evidence to argue the question and issue that are stated in introduction. The position of author is slightly vague because of a lack of information such as examples, research results or personal experience of the topic. However, the evidence provided allows position to be predicted. | Body includes one or no pieces of evidence to argue the author's main points; the audience has difficulty understanding the position of the author. |  |
| **Closing paragraph** | Conclusion is logical and complete, achieving author's intent in persuasive writing. The question and issue, which are stated in introduction, are solved with detailed, clear explanation. | Conclusion is understandable, achieving author's intent in persuasive writing fairly well. The question and issue, which are stated in the introduction, are discussed; however, this doesn't help readers to understand the intent completely. | Conclusion is not necessarily acceptable to achieve author's intent in persuasive writing. The question and issue, which are stated in introduction, are not discussed adequately; readers might be confused regarding the intent of writing. | There is little or no conclusion to identify author's intent in writing. |  |
| **Sequencing** | Author's arguments are processed logically and consistently so that audience can follow the author's points smoothly. | Author's arguments are processed fairly logically and consistently; audience hardly has difficulties following author's points smoothly. | Some logical arguments can be seen in writing; however this is not consistent and audience occasionally have difficulties following author's points smoothly. | Author's arguments are not organized at all; audience can hardly follow the author's points. |  |
| **Content** | Author argues assigned topics thoroughly. | Author argues assigned topics fairly thoroughly. | Author argues assigned topics for the most part; however, the author occasionally moves to unrelated topics. | Author doesn't understand the topics of writing. |  |
| **Grammar & Spelling** | Author uses English writing convention correctly; there are no grammar and spelling errors to prevent audience from comprehending the writing. | Author makes few minor errors in grammar and spelling; however, it doesn't prevent audience from comprehending the writing. | Author occasionally makes some errors in grammar and spelling. Sometimes they prevent audience from comprehending the writing. | Author frequently makes errors in grammar and spelling. These make audience have difficulty comprehending the writing. |  |
| **Capitalization & Punctuation** | Author is familiar with rules of capitalization and punctuation, and uses them thoroughly in the writing. | Author is quite familiar with rules of capitalization and punctuation and makes only a few such errors. However, those don't prevent audience from comprehending the writing. | Author knows basic rules of capitalization and punctuation. Author occasionally makes errors that prevent audience from comprehending the writing. | Author hardly knows rules of capitalization and punctuation and frequently makes errors; those often prevent audience from comprehending the writing. |  |
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